UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,489	08/04/2006	Eric Perouse	2006_1244A	6680
	7590 08/11/201 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			TANNER, JOCELIN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/11/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/588,489	PEROUSE, ERIC	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JOCELIN C. TANNER	3731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially red	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 25-44. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·				
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 						
13. Other:						
/Anhtuan T. Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731	/Jocelin C. Tanner/ Examiner, Art Unit 3731					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 10. The Applicant contends that the combination of Berg et al. ('048) and Goldsteen et al. fails to disclose connecting hooks to wires of the lattice at opposite sides of one mesh such that when the mesh expands the hooks cross each other. However, Berg et al. ('048) discloses a clamp formed of two external hooks that are connected to opposite sides of a mesh, as shown in the submitted figures by the Examiner within the previous Office Action. Goldsteen et al. teaches a graft being capable of expanding and contracting such that by modifying the graft of Berg et al. with the capability of expanding and contracting, the clamps attached to a mesh would be capable of opening and closing with the expansion and contraction of the meshes. Berg et al. ('713) also teaches a graft having fingers or "clamps" that overlap when implanted within a body. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have provided the clamps of Berg et al. ('048) with the capability of overlapping when closed such that tissue is compressed therebetween to ensure stability of the graft. The Applicant contends that the clamps of Berg et al. ('048) could not be crossed and still properly engage opposite surfaces of the tubing wall. However, the hooks of the clamps of Berg et al. ('048) engage the surface of the inner and outer walls and overlapping the clamps, as taught by Berg et al. ('713), would provide the advantage of helping to increase the contact area between the clamps and the tissue between them, thus providing stability to the graft upon implantation. The Applicant contends that Perez et al. fails to disclose a lattice delivery tube defining a confinement duct in which the lattice is confined in the retracted state. However, Perez et al. discloses a capsule or "retaining device" (333) within the main catheter (330) restrains a repair device (390) and prevents deployment of the graft, a stop ring or "confinement duct" within inner catheter (320) that is separate from the main catheter and includes channels into which hooks are pressed. .